



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

49
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/660,950	09/11/2003	Shawn O'Donnell	21863-000100	7016

20350 7590 05/30/2006

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 05/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/660,950

Applicant(s)

O'DONNELL, SHAWN

Examiner

Maikhanh Nguyen

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>03/31/2006</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 03/31/2006 to the original application filed 09/11/2003; IDS filed 03/31/2006.
2. Claims 1-20 are currently pending in this application. Claims 2, 5, 7-8, 11, and 13-18 have been amended. Claims 19-20 have been added. Claims 1, 5, 7, 11, 13, and 17 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

(b) This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 5-6, 11-12, and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Rawat et al.** (U.S. 6,662,340, filed 05/2002) in view of **Daswani et al.** (US 2002/0023108, filed 09/1999).

As to claim 5:

Rawat teaches a computer-implemented method of processing electronic forms (*e.g., examines electronic documents; see Abstract*), the method comprising:

- determining a first descriptor associated with a first field of a first electronic form (*e.g., field labels 102, in which each label is spatially and visually related to it corresponding field; col. 4, lines 42-45 & see fig. 1 and the associated text*);
- determining first information entered in the first field on the first electronic form (*see the filling form discussion beginning at col.4, line 30 and col.10, lines 13-15*); and
- determining if user information stored for a user comprises an identifier corresponding to the first descriptor (*e.g., field tags and then supplying the correct user data from a stored user profile, generally located on a remote server. Because no naming convention has existed for fields in an HTML form, it has been difficult to produce a fully automated form-filler application. Previously, forms had to be mapped or analyzed in advance and the mapping saved in a database of form descriptions, usually also located on a remote server. Often, user intervention is required to complete the form ... The field labels are provided*

for the user's benefit to advise them of the correct information to enter into a particular field; col. 4, lines 31-49).

Rawat, however, does not specifically teach “*updating the user information to include the first information and an identifier corresponding to the first descriptor upon determining that the user information does not comprise an identifier corresponding to the first descriptor; and updating the user information to include the first information, wherein the first information is associated with the identifier corresponding to the first descriptor.*”

Daswani teaches updating the user information to include the first information and an identifier corresponding to the first descriptor upon determining that the user information does not comprise an identifier corresponding to the first descriptor; and updating the user information to include the first information, wherein the first information is associated with the identifier corresponding to the first descriptor (*e.g., An update module D is provided and adapted to allow SW to be updated by a user ... Update procedures may include a user submitting a change of password ...including any form changes that may have been made since a last update. A user may also update personal information stored in database A such as credit card numbers, address information, phone numbers, and so on; ¶ 0052; 0053; and 0055 & also see fig.2).*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feature from Daswani in the system of Rawat because it would have provided the capability for simplifying and speeding up network navigation sessions, eliminating much download time associated with access Web pages in order to fill out on-line forms. The system would also provide convenient management services for managing password and personal user data.

As to claim 6:

Rawat teaches receiving information identifying a second electronic form (*see fig.1 and see the quick checkout form discussion beginning at col.4, line 28 and col.5, lines 27-32*); determining a set of descriptors (*e.g., field labels, field names*) associated with a set of fields (*e.g., related to its corresponding field*) included in the second electronic form (*e.g., electronic forms*), the set of descriptors including the first descriptor; and displaying the second electronic form on a computer display such that the first information is displayed in the field of the second electronic form associated with the first descriptor (*see fig.2 and the associated text*).

As to claim 19:

Rawat does not specifically teach “*updating the user information to include an identifier comprises adding the first descriptor to the user information.*”

Daswani teaches updating the user information to include an identifier comprises adding the first descriptor to the user information (§ 0052).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feature from Daswani in the system of Rawat because it would have provided the capability for simplifying and speeding up network navigation sessions, eliminating much download time associated with access Web pages in order to fill out on-line forms. The system would also provide convenient management services for managing password and personal user data.

As to claims 11-12:

Refer to claims 5-6 above. Claim 11 is the same as claim 5, except claim 11 is a computer program product claim and claim 5 is a method claim.

As to claim 17-18:

Refer to claims 5-6 above. Claim 17 is the same as claim 5, except claim 17 is a system claim and claim 5 is a method claim (*it is noted that a processor, an output device; and a memory are inherent to the system of Rawat*).

As to claim 20:

Rawat teaches the identifier corresponding to the first descriptor is the first descriptor *(e.g., field labels 102, in which each labels is spatially and visually related to its corresponding field; col. 4, lines 43-67).*

5. Claims 1-4, 7-10, and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rawat et al. in view of Maxwell et al. (U.S. 6,589,290, filed 10/1999).

As to claim 1:

Rawat teaches a computer-implemented method of processing electronic forms (*see Abstract*), the method comprising:

- receiving information identifying a first electronic form (*see fig.1 and see the quick checkout form discussion beginning at col.4, line 28 and col.5, lines 27-32*);
- determining a set of descriptors (*e.g., field labels, field names*) associated with a set of fields (*e.g., fields*) included in the first electronic form, the set of descriptors including a first descriptor associated with a first field (*e.g., each label is spatially and visually related to it corresponding field*) [*col.4, lines 31-62*];
- accessing user information comprising information identifying a set of identifiers stored for a user, the set of identifiers stored for the user including a first identifier corresponding to the first descriptor, wherein a first value is associated with the first identifier (*col.5, line 52-col.6, line 22*);

- displaying the first electronic form on a computer display such that the first value is displayed in the first field of the first electronic form (*see fig.1 and the associated text*);
- identifying at least a second descriptor associated with a field in the first electronic form (*see fig.1 and accompanying text beginning at col.4, line 30*) that does not have a corresponding identifier in the set of identifiers stored for the user;
- determining a second value entered in the field associated with the second descriptor (*col.4, lines 43-62*); and
- including an identifier (*e.g., HTML field names*) corresponding to the second descriptor (*e.g., form descriptions*) in the set of identifiers (*e.g., a plurality of fields 101*) stored for the user (*e.g., a stored user profile*), wherein the second value is associated with the identifier corresponding to the second descriptor (*col. 4, lines 27-42 & see fig.1*).

Rawat, however, does not specifically teach “*the electronic form that does not have a corresponding identifier in the set of identifiers stored for the user.*”

Maxwell teaches the electronic form that does not have a corresponding identifier in the set of identifiers stored for the user (*col.14, lines 29-61*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feature from Maxwell in the system of Rawat because it would have provided the capability for filling out electronic forms without the requirement of any prior mapping or examinations of the forms.

As to claim 2:

Rawat teaches the set of descriptors associated with the set of fields included in the first electronic form includes field names associated with the set of fields and the set of identifiers stored for the user comprises one or more field names associated with the set of fields (*col.4, lines 38-62*).

As to claim 3:

Refer to the discussion of claim 6 above for rejection.

As to claim 4:

Rawat teaches determining a third value entered in the first field of the first electronic form that is different from the first value (*see fig.2*). Rawat, however, does not specifically teach “*updating the user information such that the third value is associated with the first identifier.*”

Maxwell teaches updating the user information such that the third value is associated with the first identifier (*col.15, lines 5- 56 and col.17, lines 1-18*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feature from Maxwell in the system of Rawat because it would have provided the capability for filling out electronic forms without the requirement of any prior mapping or examinations of the forms.

As to claims 7-8 & 10:

Refer to claims 1-2 & 4 above. Claim 7 is the same as claim 1, except claim 7 is a computer program product claim and claim 1 is a method claim.

As to claim 9:

Refer to the discussion of claim 6 above for rejection.

As to claim 13

Refer to claim 1 above. Claim 13 is the same as claim 1, except claim 13 is a system claim and claim 1 is a method claim. Additionally, Rawat further teaches a communication network; a first computer; and a second computer (*see fig. 3*).

As to claims 14-16:

They include the same limitations as in claims 2-4 above, and are similar rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 03/31/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a. Applicant argues that *Rawat* does not teach anything about updating a user profile to include an identifier corresponding to a field descriptor and to include the information entered in the field associated with the descriptor [Remarks, page 14].

In response, Applicant is arguing the disclosure of the invention, not the claimed limitations. The limitation "*updating a user profile to include an identifier corresponding to a field descriptor and to include the information entered in the field associated with the descriptor*" is not claimed.

b. Applicant argues that *Maxwell* fails to teach including an identifier corresponding to the second descriptor in the set of identifiers stored for the user, wherein the second value is associated with the identifier corresponding to the second descriptor [Remarks, page 16].

In response, Rawat, not Maxwell, is used to teach including an identifier (*e.g., HTML field names*) corresponding to the second descriptor (*e.g., form descriptions*) in the set of identifiers (*e.g., a plurality of fields 101*) stored for the user (*e.g., a stored user profile*), wherein the second value is associated with the identifier corresponding to the second descriptor (*col. 4, lines 27-42 & see fig. 1*).

- c. Applicant argues that *there is no teaching in Maxwell that the data subdirectory or the user subdirectory is updated by adding an identifier corresponding to a descriptor associated with a field of a form* as cited in claim 1 [Remarks, page 17].

In response, claim 1 does not claim “*the data subdirectory or the user subdirectory is updated by adding an identifier corresponding to a descriptor associated with a field of a form.*” Claimed subject matter, not the specification is the measure of the invention. Limitations in the specification cannot be read into the claims for the purpose of avoiding the prior art. See *In re Self*, 213 USPQ 1,5 (CCPA 1982); *In re Priest*, 199 USPQ 11, 15 (CCPA 1978). The Examiner has a *duty and responsibility* to the public and to Applicant to interpret the claims *as broadly as reasonably possible* during prosecution (see *In re Prater*, 56 CCPA 1381, 415 F.2d 1393, 162 USPQ 541 (1969)).

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact information


8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

Art Unit: 2176

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MN


HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100